

REMARKS

Claims 39-48, 50-67, 69-82 and 84 are pending. Claims 39-48, 51-55, 57-67, 70-72, 75-77 and 80-82 stand rejected. Claims 49, 50, 56, 68, 69, 73, 74, 78, 79, 83, and 84 stand objected to, but would be allowable if re-written in independent form. In the interest of placing the application in condition for allowance, Applicants have incorporated the limitations recited by these allowable dependent claims into pending independent claims 39, 47, 48 and 57. Applicants hereby cancel claims 49, 68, 83 and 85. Applicants have also amended various claims to correct typographical errors and provide proper antecedent bases.

Objections and Related 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

The Office Action maintains its objection to the specification and its related 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the “release mechanism” limitation. Applicants have amended the written description portion of the specification to include the term release mechanism. Specifically, paragraph [0020] of the application now states, “[e]xternally threaded screw 58 or other fastener may also serve as a release mechanism adapted to release barbs 54 from retaining a first cable duct section positioned within a first duct-receiving portion of coupler 20.” Thus, although release mechanism can correspond to other structures, in one embodiment of the present invention, the release mechanism is the threaded fastener.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of both the objection and rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 102/103 Rejections

Claims 39-48, 51-54, 57-65, 70, 75 and 80 stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,316,243 to Henneberger (hereinafter “Henneberger”). Claims 39-42, 44, 45-48, 51-53, 57-60, 62-67, 70-72, 75-77 and 80-82 stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,752,781 to Haataja et al. (hereinafter “Haataja”). Claim 55 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Henneberger in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,338,083 to Gute.

As previously mentioned, the Office Action indicates that claims 49, 50, 56, 68, 69, 73, 74, 78, 79, 83, and 84 would be allowable if re-written in independent form.

Applicants have, therefore, incorporated the limitations recited by dependent claims 68 and 83 into independent claims 38 and 57 respectively. Applicants have also incorporated the limitations recited by dependent claim 49 into independent claims 47 and 48.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of these independent claims is in condition for allowance. Since all pending dependent claims depend from an allowable base or intervening claim, applicants further submit that these dependent claims are likewise allowable.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is earnestly solicited. If, in the Examiner's opinion, another telephonic interview would be helpful, Applicants' representative can be reached at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,
PANDUIT CORP.

August 30, 2006

By: Jonathan Harris
Jonathan A. Harris
Reg. No. 44,744

WILDMAN, HARROLD, ALLEN & DIXON LLP
225 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
Ph. 312/201-2189
Fax 312/201-2555
1696927